

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 DARREN GILBERT,
11 Plaintiff,
12 v.
13 DOCTOR'S CHOICE MODESTO, LLC, et
14 al.,
15 Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-00690-AWI-SAB
ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION REQUEST FOR ADMISSION
(ECF No. 86)

16 On September 7, 2022, the Court granted counsel Rachelle Taylor Golden's motion to
17 withdraw as counsel as to Defendant and Cross-Claimant Amar Kumar ("Kumar"), and on
18 September 9, 2022, amended the order to also grant the motion to withdraw Rachelle Taylor
19 Golden as attorney for Defendants Nindiseventeen LTD. Liability Co., and Nindi2039 LLC, as
20 well. (ECF Nos. 84, 85.)

21 On September 15, 2022, Amar Kumar filed, and on September 19, 2022, the Court
22 docketed, a filing from Amar Kumar that is entitled Motion Request for Admission, Informed
23 Consent. (ECF No. 86.) The filing's title also contains the names of parties: Amar Kumar;
24 Nindi2039 LLC; Shaibi Abdulqawi dba J's Smoke Shop # 9; Nindiseventeen LTD. Liability Co.;
25 Arif Faisal dba Global Smoke Shop. (ECF No. 86 at 1.) The filing references the motion to
26 withdraw granted as to Kumar. (ECF No. 86 at 2.) Under the heading "Absent Informed
27 Consent," the filing states: "Amar Kumar (female) was landlord to tenant Doctor's Choice
28

1 (vacant). Doctor's Choice was a retail store in a small existing strip mall . . . [that] has many
2 landlords and tenants with varied individual businesses." (*Id.*) Kumar then cites California Rule
3 of Court 1.7, pertaining to conflict of interest, and stating a lawyer shall not, without informed
4 consent from each client, represent a client if the representation is directly adverse to another
5 client in the same or a separate matter.

6 It is not clear what Amar Kumar's motion is requesting of the Court. It is not clear
7 whether Plaintiff is averring that former counsel Rachelle Golden violated a duty, as the proof of
8 service does indicate the motion was served on her, and only her. (ECF No. 86 at 3.) The Court
9 notes that Amar Kumar previously submitted a letter to the Court on August 25, 2022,
10 demonstrating Amar Kumar terminated the legal relationship with Rachelle Golden, and stating
11 he "appreciate[d] the long hours and hard work . . . I can't afford to hire new counsel." (ECF
12 No. 81.) It is not clear what relief Plaintiff could obtain through a motion filed in this regard, at
13 this juncture, or if Plaintiff would be required to file a malpractice action.

14 Given the title of the motion as one requesting admission, it is not clear whether Amar
15 Kumar is requesting some sort of admission to the Court allowing her to represent any of the
16 corporate defendants in this action, or if she is requesting permission to file electronically.¹ To
17 the extent she is averring that there is informed consent or wishes to represent any of the
18 corporate entities, a non-attorney cannot represent the corporate entities, and Kumar can only
19 represent herself if she is not an attorney. See Rowland v. California Men's Colony, Unit II
20 Men's Advisory Council, 506 U.S. 194, 201–02 (1993) ("It has been the law for the better part of
21 two centuries, for example, that a corporation may appear in the federal courts only through
22 licensed counsel . . . [a]s the courts have recognized, the rationale for that rule applies equally to
23 all artificial entities.").

24 **However, to the extent Kumar is the owner or associated with the corporate entities,**
25 **Kumar and these parties are reminded that the Court's September 9, 2022 order required**

26 ¹ The Local Rules generally require pro se parties to file and serve paper documents. See E.D. Cal. Local Rule
27 133(a). A *pro se* litigant may request an exception to this requirement by filing a joint stipulation or by "written
28 motion[] setting out an explanation of reasons for the exception." E.D. Cal. Local Rule 133(b)(2), (3). Kumar's
filing contains no explanation for or justification or clear request for access to the electronic filing system. Thus, to
the extent the filing was such a request, the request is denied.

1 the Defendants Nindiseventeen LTD. Liability Co., and Nindi2039 LLC, to secure
2 substitute counsel within thirty (30) days of entry of that order.

3 Given the filing is vague and the Court cannot discern what relief the motion is
4 requesting of the Court, the Court shall deny Amar Kumar's motion.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Amar Kumar's motion (ECF No. 86) is
6 DENIED.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: September 20, 2022


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28